

servers, Microsoft now operates in a world where anyone running a browser will soon have the same capabilities as today's Windows users. That is why the government should keep it's hands off.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, one editorial is by Robert Levy, a senior fellow of constitutional studies at the CATO Institute. He starts his op-ed piece:

Here's the lesson that high-tech companies can glean from Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson's findings in the Microsoft case: If you're sufficiently ambitious, competent, and hard-working; if you're willing to risk your time and fortune; if you succeed at rising above your competition by serving customers with better products; then watch out, because our government will come down on your neck with the force and effect of a guillotine.

The editorial in the Wall Street Journal probably sums it up best of all. There is no question my colleagues from the other side of the aisle—or should I say their political machinery as expressed by—I don't want to call them outbursts, but certainly the expressions of our Attorney General, Janet Reno, are best summed up when they discussed the Microsoft case this morning in the Wall Street Journal. Here is their concluding paragraph:

But let's get to the real bottom line. Washington's crusade against Microsoft has fulfilled its purpose, serving as a great lever to pry open the wallets of the Silicon Valley. Where three years ago the technological plutocrats spent their surplus income on racing yachts and Ferraris and charity, now they patriotically send donations to Washington to support the fixer class and its retinue in the style to which it would like to become accustomed.

Steve Case of AOL, who happens to be on the other side of this issue, recognizes the problem, though. He says the future of technology will be decided in the political arena rather than the marketplace. My guess is, if that is true, your computers will not be working as well tomorrow as they are working today.

I came to the floor this morning to join with my colleague from Wyoming, not to discuss the Microsoft case; that is going to get played out over time, and I think we are going to have a Federal judge who will try to run the technology business of this country. Maybe we need to decide to start a new agency of our Federal Government called U.S. Department of Microsoft. If it is as profitable as Microsoft, maybe we can make a lot more money without taxing the American public to allow our Democrat colleagues on the other side of the aisle to spend it.

Certainly Microsoft is now making as much as \$1 billion a month in cash to spend. It is obvious somebody else wants their hands on that or wants to break up that very profitable business.

VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, what I came to the floor to talk about is a combination of issues that come together in the issue of violence. We watched the great tragedy as a fellow

entered a workplace in Hawaii the week before last and killed some of his coworkers. Last week in Seattle, another man went into a business and shot and killed individuals. All of us, as Americans, are tremendously frustrated by this expression of violence or people seeming to want to solve their personal problems by acting in a very violent fashion. The Washington Post poll on Sunday showed that the No. 2 issue among Republicans was violence in the schools; the No. 4 issue among Democrats, violence in the schools; the No. 2 issue among Independents in America was violence, violence in the schools.

Our President last week suggested we live in a very violent society, when in fact violence is down substantially in our country. It is true that it is. We have come off a very violent year, but over the last 7 years the average rate of acts of violence is dropping, in the broad sense. Yet we have had some of these tremendously public-attention-gathering events that caused the American public to be concerned, as they are.

Of course, the issue I want to speak briefly about this morning is the question of how we fix this violent expression in our society. Last week, the President, Janet Reno, and AL GORE said there is a quick and easy way to fix it: We just need to pass a few more laws; gun laws, that is. We need to add to the 25,000 to 30,000 gun laws that are already on the books. If we do that, we will make America a safer place in which to live. Or at least we will say, politically, to meet the polls the Washington Post presented to us on Sunday, that if we pass the laws, the public at least will think America is a safer place in which to live. By that, we will be able to curry their political favor in the next election.

If gun laws make America a safer place, then what happened in Hawaii should not have happened; what happened in Seattle should not have happened; what happened in Littleton, CO, at Columbine High School, should not have happened—because there are laws to stop that. Mr. President, 13 laws were violated, tragically, by those two young men who later took their lives at Columbine High School in Littleton, CO, after they had killed so many of their classmates. But there was a law to stop them. Then why did it happen?

I do not know the answer to why it happened. I do know they broke a lot of laws to cause it to happen. Yet our President last week, and the Vice President, and the Attorney General said give us more laws and the world will be a safer place. We have all been on this floor discussing, for well over a year, our frustrations with problems with our culture, problems with our public schools. People are acting out their frustrations in violent ways by taking other people's lives. My guess is, you cannot legislate a fix on that one.

There are other problems within our society that have to be addressed. So

let me focus for just a moment on Hawaii. There, we all know what happened. The fellow has been caught. We all know now he probably, during that act, was mentally incompetent, mentally in trouble, mentally deranged. But his actions cost lives.

His actions happened in a unique environment, though. Hawaii has more gun laws, to control gun ownership and gun usage, than any other State in the United States. So would logic not follow, at least the logic of the President and the Vice President and the Attorney General, if that were so, Hawaii should have been a terribly safe place? Hawaii is the only State in the Nation where you not only register every gun you have with the local and State authorities, you also register the bullets—you register the ammunition. Somehow, politicians in the State legislature in Hawaii thought that would make Hawaii a safe place—the only State in the Nation.

It just so happens, Janet Reno and AL GORE and the President want us to do the same in this country. But it did not stop the individual who killed his colleagues in Hawaii.

How about a permit to purchase? Of course, that is exactly what some of our colleagues would want here. Hawaii requires a permit to purchase any kind of gun—not just one permit for multiple purchases but a permit for every purchase—and a full background check, and the requirement that you must be at least 21 years of age to own a gun.

What about assault pistols and Saturday night specials and all those kinds of buzzwords about guns that have become villains here on the floor for political purposes? All of those are outlawed in Hawaii. It is against the law to own them. It is against the law to have them. All of that is the law in Hawaii. The man who did the killings in Hawaii had met all of the requirements of the law. Yet the law did not protect the citizens whose families now mourn their death.

How about high-capacity magazines? That was a fully debated issue here on the floor of the Senate this past year. I was on the floor with Senator HATCH and Senator LAUTENBERG on that issue after Littleton. It is against the law in Hawaii.

Then there are the restrictions on places of possession, where you simply cannot have a gun: A business; you can't travel with one, only in the owner's home and in very restricted places; or if you are traveling from the home to the firing range or the pistol range for target practice, you may have a gun on your person. Those are tough laws in Hawaii. Yet people are dead. Of course, I mentioned transportation and the restriction on transportation. All of those are parts of the laws that guard citizens against the violent acts of others with the use of a firearm in the State of Hawaii.

The President, the Vice President, and the Attorney General seem not to understand that or, if they do, they are

finding another reason to express a need for greater gun control in this country. I am not sure what that need is. We all know our citizens are concerned about violence.

We all know we have citizens in our country who act out their frustrations in violent ways. It is tragic that we believe we can simply turn to Congress that will pass a law and, therefore, the violence will go away.

Are the President and the Vice President and the Attorney General trying to hide something? Are they trying to hide the fact that during the Clinton administration arrests and prosecutions of citizens who violate Federal firearms laws has dropped by over 70 percent?

Is the President trying to mask the fact that the Puerto Rican terrorists to whom he offered clemency were violators of Federal firearms laws and they killed American citizens?

Is this President, once again, trying to throw up a political smokescreen by simply saying we need more laws against the use of guns or the ownership of guns or the second amendment rights when he, the President, in my opinion, has violated the intent of the laws as they now stand? If you do not use the law, if you do not prosecute under the law, if you do not enforce the law, then the laws are no good.

That is the message I send to Bill Clinton today: Mr. Clinton, look at your own record. Your own Attorney General has let it be known to U.S. attorneys around the country that it is not worth their time to go after violators of Federal firearms laws.

There is a great program down in Richmond, VA, where a Federal prosecutor said to the local police: You arrest them and I will throw them away, I will put them behind bars if they use a gun in the commission of a crime. Crime dropped precipitously but, more important, crimes with a gun involved dropped dramatically. One fellow was arrested at a 7-Eleven with a stick, and after he was arrested, the local police said: Why are you robbing a 7-Eleven with a stick?

He said: Because if I used a firearm, they will lock me up down here.

Mr. President, Bill Clinton, don't you get the message now? We have plenty of laws on the books if we had an Attorney General who was a real cop, a supercop, a tough person who was saying to her U.S. attorneys: Let's put them behind bars if they use guns; let's throw those kids out of school who take a gun to school. They do not have the right to be in our schools if they are putting the rest of our kids in jeopardy.

Last year that happened over 3,000 times and only 13 were prosecuted. Sorry, Mr. President, sorry, Mr. Vice President, sorry, Ms. Attorney General, passing laws does not a safer world make. Enforcing the ones we have, being concerned about the culture, being concerned about the kids, their parents, and their educators in a

way that not only makes a safe school but makes a concerned citizen is going to drop violence in America. Do not give the American public a political placebo by simply passing another law.

I thank my colleague from Wyoming, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Idaho. Certainly, this is one of the issues that is contentious and will, I suppose, be debated some more. I agree with the notion we need to do something more than passing more laws. It has no evidence of success.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, one of the bills currently being considered, and is very important to the West particularly, is the Interior funding bill, the bill that funds the Interior Department, national parks, the Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and others. It is relatively small compared to others. It is around \$13 billion, \$14 billion. I never thought I would suggest that is small, but compared to \$360 billion it is relatively small.

It has been tied up for a number of reasons. It has to do with the so-called land legacy the administration has been pushing recently, the idea of purchasing a great amount of land that has something to do with S. 25 that will bring in dollars from the Outer Continental Shelf royalties to be used in this area.

The controversy is over the purchase of additional lands. There are some good things about S. 25—taking some more money from oil royalties and using them for parks. I am chairman of the Parks Subcommittee, and I met this morning with the new advisory committee that will be focusing on concessions. The parks are more and more in demand, more and more people are coming to them, and more and more people are taking advantage of the parks, one of the legacies of this country. We are having problems with the upkeep of the infrastructure that must be done to preserve historic and natural values. I support that.

The park system, of course, has to be part of another section of parks, and that is local and State parks. National parks are not designed to provide all the services that people need. In communities, these are local responsibilities. Ball parks, for example, are put in by State and local parks. So they, too, need additional funding.

One of the interesting areas, particularly those in the West where they do a great deal of wild game hunting, is a thing called teaming for wildlife. In our State, for example, the funds that go to the game and fish department come from the purchase of licenses for game animals. They spend a great deal of their time dealing with animals that are not game animals that are threatened, endangered.

The problem, however, is the administration insists on having \$1 billion a year to spend as they choose to buy land. This week, we had a hearing on the Forest Service setting aside 40 million acres by fiat, by administrative decree, to be used for de facto wilderness, if they choose, when under the law clearly to set aside land of that kind is the responsibility of the Congress.

We are having increasing difficulty with that. I do not know whether it is driven by the President's desire to have a legacy, to be a latter century Theodore Roosevelt, or whether it is the environmental aspect of the Gore campaign. The fact is, the White House is not a monarchy; it does not decide to do these things individually. There has to be a cooperative arrangement with the Congress, whether it is purchasing or whether it is assigning different designations to land. That is the way it is, and it needs to be preserved in that fashion, in my judgment.

We need to move forward with the Interior bill. It is one of about three bills that remains out of the 13, which is kind of surprising because it is one upon which most people here agree. There are a couple of things in it that are being used which I think are not realistic. One has to do with permits for grazing on Forest Service lands. Ranchers in the West—they have their base lands, of course—use grazing so we can have multiple use of public lands and forests, have grazing leases. In order to renew those leases, there needs to be a study. No one argues with the idea there needs to be a study. Unfortunately, they have not been able to keep up with the number of studies that need to be made, and so the study is not made before the permit expires and the Federal Government says: That's too bad, you're out of luck; take your cows and go home—when it has nothing to do with the permittee having not gotten the job done.

What this amendment to the Interior bill says is the permit will be renewed for a period of time until this study can be made. If the study is made and there have to be changes, then there can be changes. That is held up somehow by the White House, and they are making a big thing and separating that out.

The other is on oil royalties. We worked a long time trying to get fairness in oil royalties, taking out some of the charges and costs before the Government takes over, and percentage of royalties. We have not come to an agreement. This simply says, let's set it aside until the Congress and the executive department can come together. Again, not a willingness to work in a team fashion.

I am hopeful we can get by those kinds of things this week. We are aiming to get out of here in 3 days, in fact. The fact is, it is possible.

There are really only about three bills that need to be determined. Everyone knows what changes need to be